International Baptist Theological Seminary – Prague

Evangelism and Social Responsibility: Baptist Understandings and the Lausanne Debate

By

Lee Hanson

Assignment:

Master of Theology Dissertation

submitted to the Course Leader of Baptist and Anabaptist Studies
Dr Keith Jones
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Theology, Baptist and Anabaptist Studies, University of Wales

September 2012

Essay Length: 20,577 words including footnotes and excluding bibliography

I Introduction…… 3

II Evangelism and Social Concern: Baptist Exemplars ……..
- **A. William Carey**…….. 5
- **B. William Knibb and mission work in Jamaica**…….. 10
- **C. American Baptists and Slavery**…….. 14
- **D. The Evangelical Alliance and Social Issues**…….. 17

III Evangelical and Ecumenical…….. 22
- **A. John Mott: unity in evangelism**…….. 22
- **B. The Social Gospel**…….. 26
  Mott, Rauschenbusch, Meyer
- **C. Edinburgh World Missionary Conference, 1910**…….. 30
- **D. Lausanne 1974**…….. 33
- **E . Manila 1989**…….. 36
- **C. Cape Town 2010**…….. 38

IV Evangelism and Social Concern: Continuing Controversy…….. 41
- **A. Rene Padilla, John Piper and Cape Town**…….. 41
- **B. Interview with Lindsay Brown**…….. 43
- **C. Interview with Billie Hanks, Jr**…….. 56
- **D. Conclusion**…….. 58

V Conclusion…….. 59

Bibliography…….. 62

Chapter I
Introduction

At the Lausanne III Congress, held in Cape Town, South Africa, 2010, the expressed aim was to "strengthen, inspire and equip the Church for world evangelism in our generation, and to exhort Christians in their duty to engage in issues of public and social concern."[1] Rene Padilla, who was a crucial figure at the first Lausanne Congess, in 1974, has been deeply critical of the dichotomy between evangelism and social responsibility. He believes this to be the theological approach of many in the West, who assume that "the *primary* mission of the church is world evangelization conceived in terms of the oral delivery of the Gospel, while engagement in issues of public and social concern – the good works through which Christians fulfill their vocation as 'light of the world' to the glory of God (Matt. 5:14-16) – are a *secondary* duty for which Christians do not need to be strengthened, inspired, or equipped but only exhorted."[2]

There seems to be a continuing rift in the evangelical movement on this issue. When I use the term 'evangelical' I am following the lead given by Bebbington who argues that there are four qualities that have been the special marks of evangelicalism: conversionism, the belief that lives need to be changed; activism, the expression of the gospel in effort; biblicism, a particular regard for the Bible; and crucicentrism, a stress on the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Together he sees them forming a quadrilateral of priorities that is the basis of evangelicalism.[3] Some of these evangelicals maintain a dichotomy between evangelism and social responsibility, seeing evangelism as having a primary role and social action as having secondary importance. By contrast there are those who believe that the "church's integral

[1] C. Rene Padilla, 'The Future of the Lausanne Movement', *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Overseas Ministries Study Center, New Haven, Vol. 35, No. 2 April 2011, p. 86 (his italics)
[2] ibid, p. 87
[3] D.W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* (London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1989), p. 3.

mission is rooted in the mission of God in Jesus Christ, a mission that involves the whole person in community, the whole of God's creation, and every aspect of life."[4]

The topic I will be seeking to investigate in this Dissertation has this question as its background and focus: are evangelism and social responsibility two separate activities, or are they inseparable components of the gospel? I will be looking at this with special reference to Baptist involvement in the issue. I also want to relate the issue to that of a wider Baptist vision for interdenominational evangelical cooperation and ecumenical involvement and to explore to what extent the presence or absence of this kind of wider vision has had an influence on historic Baptist views about evangelism and social action.

The first chapter of the Dissertation will look at William Carey, the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS) and the mission work done in India, at William Knibb and BMS mission in Jamaica, and at the issue of slavery. In the next chapter I will examine evangelicals and the ecumenical movement and will focus on John Mott, Edinburgh 1910 and the Lausanne Movement - Lausanne, 1974, Manila, 1987, and Cape Town 2010. The final major chapter of this study will look at the debate that came from Cape Town about evangelism and social concern. I will include here two Baptists, Rene Padilla and John Piper. I also feature two interviews, with Lindsay Brown, co-chair of the Cape Town Congress, and Billie Hanks. Jr. of Evangelism Explosion. The final chapter contains concluding remarks.

[4] Padilla, 'Lausanne Movement', in *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, p. 87

Chapter II

Evangelism and Social Concern: Baptist Exemplars

A. William Carey

Although it would be possible to look at seventeenth-century Baptist approaches to the gospel in society, it is appropriate in the light of the Lausanne concern for world mission to begin by looking at the history of the modern Protestant missionary movement. For Baptists the crucial figure is William Carey. However, in his book published in 1792, *An Enquiry into the Obligation of Christians, to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens*, Carey examined the history of world mission and said this: "But none of the moderns have equalled the Moravian Brethren in this good work."[5] Moravians, who consistently combined social concern with evangelism, provided a role model.[6] The desire to do more 'good work' led to the Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen, later known as the Baptist Missionary Society, being formed in 1792.[7] From 1784 until this point of formation, Carey had been seeking to persuade his fellow pastors in the Northamptonshire Baptist Association to consider world mission. Allegedly he was rebuked by John Ryland, who it is said remarked, "Young man, sit down; when God pleases to convert the heathen, he will do it without your aid and mine."[8] But in Carey's mind it was time for the pastors to act.

The social background of the Baptist missionary task force is relevant to Carey's outlook. Significantly, S. Pearce Carey (Carey's biographer and grandson), noted that Carey challenged some of his fellow-ministers to consider "what Moravians are

[5] The full text of Carey's *Enquiry* is in several printings. See for example Timothy George, *Faithful Witness: The Life and Mission of William Carey* (Leicester: IVP, 1991).
[6] See D. A. Schattschneider, 'William Carey, Modern Missions and the Moravian Influence', *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (1998), pp. 8-12.
[7] For the Baptist Missionary Society, see B. Stanley, *The History of the Baptist Missionary Society, 1792-1992* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992).
[8] George, *Faithful Witness*, p. 53

daring, and some of them British like ourselves, and many only artisan and poor".[9] Many Baptists were similar to the Moravians in their social standing. It is not, however, that the Moravians were the only influence on Carey. He was impressed by Jonathan Edward's *Account of the Life of the Late Rev. David Brainerd*, which tells of Brainerd taking the gospel to the American Indians. There were also the travel journals of James Cook. Carey's imagination was fired. Finally a number of Baptist pastors accepted the argument that it was the responsibility of all Christians to spread the gospel to the world, and that this was not just a commission for the apostles in the first century. The first missionary the new Society chose was Dr. John Thomas, who had come back from initial missionary endeavours in Calcutta, India, and was seeking support to continue. William Carey volunteered to join Thomas.

After months of raising support and finding a ship to sail to India, processes which were full of difficulty, they set off, and after a five month journey the group, which included Carey's family, arrived in India. The British East India Company did not want missionaries, and in fact had influenced the British government to make missionary work illegal in India, so they would not issue permits to Carey and Thomas. After a number of years in which Carey supported himself, mainly by managing an Indigo plant, he moved with his new Baptist missionary colleagues Joshua Marshman and William Ward, to Serampore, a Danish protectorate, where they had permission to do missionary work. From their base in Serampore the Baptists found ways to engage in evangelism and to reach all levels of Indian society.[10] The British government was operating 'top down', and so what Carey and his associates did in cutting across social classes was radical.

There were various ways in which social involvement by the Baptists took place. Education was one important aspect. Carey and the other Serampore missionaries

[9] S. P. Carey, *William Carey* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923), p. 90.
[10] E. D. Potts, *British Baptist Missionaries in India, 1793-1837* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 114.

pioneered educational projects. The language used in the education was the local language, Bengali.[11] The result of this vision was the setting up of Serampore College. There Science and Oriental languages, as well as theology, were taught. As is well known, as part of their vision of social reform Carey and the other Baptist missionaries drew attention to the plight of widows in India. In particular they condemned the practice of *sati*, in which widows were burned on their husband's funeral pyres. Baptist estimates suggested that 25,000-30,000 such murders were taking place in Bengal each year, although there was no way in fact of knowing the numbers and they might not have been as high as the estimates. The East India Company was intent on trading, and did not want to cause any controversy about local customs, but the missionaries were determined to highlight this terrible social evil - as they were convinced it was - so that British public opinion might be mobilized against it. In 1829 *sati* was declared illegal in Bengal.[12]

Over the course of several decades, William Carey and his fellow missionaries addressed social issues as well as seeking to bring people to individual conversion. They were involved in some medical work. They had success in making it illegal to kill babies by offering them to the gods - children were left outside to be eaten by wild animals or to die from exposure, or children were thrown in the river to be eaten by crocodiles. Carey documented these practices and petitioned the British government, and in 1802 a law was passed to end infanticide. The Baptist missionaries were also opposed to the caste system, and there is little doubt that part of their reaction was because as Nonconformists they had been second class citizens in England. Daniel Potts, one of the writers who told the story of Serampore, contrasted Church of England chaplains in Bengal with the Baptist missionaries. He suggests that the 'Oxbridge chaplains', including the evangelical chaplains, 'had a thinly veiled contempt for the scholarly abilities of men like Carey and Marshman, whose religious beliefs would have excluded them from the great English universities'.[13] The

[11] Jeffrey Cox, *The British Missionary Enterprise since 1700* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 81
[12] Potts, *British Baptist Missionaries in India*, pp. 144-57.
[13] ibid., p. 54.

word ‘contempt’ is too strong, since the two leading evangelical Anglican chaplains in Bengal appointed Carey to a teaching post at the Fort William College, Calcutta, which trained civil servants. But injustice was keenly felt by the Baptists.

William Carey had a developing vision of creating missionary communities in parts of India, made up of three or four couples. The goal would be that this kind of community would be self-sufficient, and would be able to engage with the local society they were ministering to. Hopefully, new converts would join the community, for they would be the ones who would bring the gospel to the nation of India. As noted above, Carey was interested in the Moravians, and he was impressed that they lived together in communities. Although he had no prior experience of this, Carey had proposed at an early stage that in Baptist mission in India a similar policy be adopted.[14] Andrew Fuller, who was an important and influential Baptist theologian and minister and was the first Secretary of the BMS, commented positively about Carey’s idea: “The experience of the Moravians seems to sanction it.”[15] This community was what was set up by the missionaries at Serampore and as it reached out to Indians of all castes it is an example of social change in action. A weekly conference was held at Serampore, at which up to 150 people would eat together and worship, rather like the way a Moravian love-feast operated.[16]

Finally, Carey had a desire and hope for the cooperating together of different denominations in mission work. In 1792, in his *Enquiry*, in which he proposed that the Baptists should set up a missionary society, Carey also said this:

> I do not mean by this, in any wise to confine it to one denomination of Christians. I wish with all my heart that every one who loves our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, would in some way or other engage in it. But in the

[14] T. G. Carter, *The Journal and Selected Letters of William Carey* (Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2000), p. 136.
[15] J.C.S. Mason, *The Moravian Church and the Missionary Awakening in England, 1760-1800* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001), p. 174.
[16] S.P. Carey, *William Carey*, p. 90.

> present divided state of Christendom, it would be more likely for good to be done by each denomination engaging separately in work, than if they were to embark in it conjointly. There is room enough for us all, without interfering with each other; and if no unfriendly interference took place, each denomination would bear good will to the other, and pray for the success, considering it as upon the whole friendly to the great cause of true religion; but if all were intermingle, it is likely their private discords might throw damp upon their spirit, and much retard their public usefulness.[17]

Carey seems to have been expressing a hope "that everyone who loves our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity" could work together in mission. This provides reasonable grounds for suggesting that Carey was ecumenical in his vision for mission from the very beginning. In addition, Carey, after 13 or so years in India, urged a gathering of missionaries to take place in 1810. Writing in 1806 to his friend and supporter Andrew Fuller, he made the following significant suggestion:

> The Cape of Good Hope is now in the hands of the English. Should it continue so, would it not be possible to have a general association of all denominations of Christians from the four quarters of the world, kept there once in about ten years? I earnestly recommend this plan. Let the first meeting be in the year 1810, or 1812, at furthest. I have no doubt but it would be attended with very important effects. We could understand one another better; and more entirely enter into one another's views by two hours' conversation, than by two or three years' epistolary correspondence.[18]

This notion was not fully appreciated. Ernest Payne has noted that Fuller's reaction was to see this suggestion as "one of Carey's pleasing dreams".[19] A gathering

---

[17] William Carey, *An Enquiry into the Obligation of Christians, to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen* (reprint, Carey Kingsgate Press Limited, London 1961), p. 84. Introduction by E.A. Payne.
[18] E.A. Payne, "Introduction", to Carey, *Enquiry*, pp. xviii-xix; cf. Mary Drewery, *William Carey: Shoemaker and Missionary* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978), pp. 137-38.
[19] Carey, *Enquiry*, p. xix.

inspired by this vision eventually took place, in 1910, in Edinburgh, and we will look at that later.

It is clear that Carey and the early Baptist missionaries in India did not separate evangelism from social concern. They were motivated to tell those who had not yet heard about the Gospel, and so first Carey and Thomas and then others who went to India did precisely that. Gradually there were conversions. In following the command to go, the Baptists also engaged in efforts to end what they believed to be evil practices, and to achieve societal betterment. Carey used his skills to have laws changed regarding infanticide and *Sati*. It seems that in Carey's case there was an instinct towards working together across denominations and also a vision for what can be called holistic mission – evangelism and social action. It is not that one produced the other. Rather I would suggest that a broader vision of mission produced a hope for co-operation and for change.

B. William Knibb and mission work in Jamaica

William Knibb became a missionary with the BMS after offering to the Society to go to Jamaica to join the Baptist mission work there. His brother had gone to Jamaica a few years earlier as a missionary, but died at the age of 24 after only a year on the field [20] William had become an apprentice in Kettering in 1816 and at that stage was not thinking of overseas mission. He was baptized in 1822. When his brother died, William volunteered to take his place; he was 21 and just married. He and his wife, Mary, went to Jamaica in 1824. As William and Mary Knibb settled into Jamaica they were shocked by the treatment of these slaves. It is suggested by Catherine Hall in her *Civilising Subjects* that these Baptist missionaries in Jamaica – as well as the Knibbs there were others such as Thomas Burchell and James M. Phillippo – were the first white people in Jamaica who were not primarily interested in making a fortune there. Their concern, as she notes, was for Christian mission, which initially

[20] Stanley, *The History of the Baptist Missionary Society*, p. 74

for them meant preaching the Gospel and drawing people into Baptist churches. In 1827 there were eight Baptist chapels in Jamaica, with 5,000 members. In 1835 there were 13,795 members in the Baptist chapels.[21] As was often the case in that period, these numbers do not represent the numbers attending services, which were considerably larger. Although the Baptist preachers, and indeed the BMS, did not want to become involved in politics, the planters who owned the slaves saw the preachers as a threat. A new Slave Law was passed in Jamaica 1826, which was intended to restrict the work of the preachers.[22]

The missionaries from England were not the first to plant Baptist churches in Jamaica. A freed slave from Virginia, George Lisle,[23] came to Jamaica in 1782 and founded a Baptist Church in Kingston. Lisle sought help from Nonconformists in England and the British Baptists responded by financial support and were also prompted to send missionaries to help with schools and chapels. When Knibb arrived in Jamaica in 1824 he found Baptist congregations which were mainly comprised of African slaves. He joined force with a few other British missionaries and they reached out to the slaves, who were working on the sugar plantations. Knibb began as schoolmaster at the Baptist mission school in Kingston. He not only formed a close association with two of his fellow Baptist missionaries but also with other Nonconformist missionaries. All were opposed to slavery. In the mission context there was an understanding of the need for social involvement and also wider alliances. These Nonconformists did not feel that they were working under the authority of the government in the way that was felt by Anglicans, and being independent they could oppose the idea of slavery and openly work against it. William Knibb expressed his feelings in this way,

> The cursed blast of slavery has, like a pestilence, withered almost every moral bloom. I know not how any person can feel a union with such a

[21] Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), pp. 88-89.
[22] ibid., pp. 98-100.
[23] I.K. Sibley, *The Baptists of Jamaica* (Kingston, Jamaica: The Jamaica Baptist Union, 1965), p. 1.

> monster, such a child of hell. I feel a burning hatred against it and look upon it as one of the most odious monsters that ever disgraced the earth…the iron hand of oppression daily endeavours to keep the slaves in the ignorance to which it has reduced them.[24]

One slave, Sam Swiney, was unjustly accused (a frequent occurrence) of a minor crime. Swiney was a deacon in Knibb's church and Knibb spoke in his defence at the trial. However the colonial authorities found Swiney guilty and ordered him to be flogged and to serve hard labour. William Knibb wrote of this injustice in a Jamaican newspaper. Knibb not only found himself in opposition to the local magistrates but was also drawn into a confrontation with George Bridges, the nearby Anglican Rector. In the setting in which slave-owners attended the Anglican church, Bridges defended them. He saw the Baptists and other Nonconformists as dangerous.[25] E. A. Payne highlights the way that socio-political issues came into the forefront of Baptist mission. He argues that Knibb became politically disruptive through the evidence he gave to Britain's political leaders about how slaves were being treated.[26] Knibb made his case so well that the news of this went all the way to the government in London, and eventually the two colonial officials responsible lost their jobs for administering this inappropriate punishment. There was, however, an intensified Colonial backlash against the missionaries following a slave revolt led by another Baptist deacon, Sam Sharpe, in 1831.

In 1830 Knibb had become the pastor of a large African Baptist church in Falmouth in Jamaica. In 1832, the Baptists of Jamaica sent Knibb back to Britain to represent them in the debate on the emancipation of slavery in the British territories. The move to England was not in line with official BMS thinking. But Knibb was determined. He travelled throughout the country telling about the good work the churches in Jamaica were doing and how oppressively slaves were being

[24] John Howard Hinton, *Memoir of William Knibb* (London: Houlston and Stoneman, 1847), p. 48
[25] Stanley, *History of the Baptist Missionary Society*, pp. 74-5. Hall, *Civilising Subjects*, pp. 101-102.
[26] See E. A. Payne, *Freedom in Jamaica: Some chapters in the story of the BMS* (London: Carey Press, 1933).

treated in the colonies. He also had the opportunity to speak to Parliament, and his evidence, as James Howard Hinton (Secretary of the Baptist Union)put it, "was so complete and unassailable; and it contributed largely, more largely perhaps than that of any other single witness, to the general impression which then took root in the public mind that slavery must be speedily abolished."[27] Knibb addressed a large abolitionist meeting at the Exeter Hall in London. Knibb made clear that he was pursuing a Christian and moral cause. He stated:

> ... there is nothing more delightful than to stand forward as the advocate of the innocent and persecuted; and when I consider that on the present occasion I appear before an assembly of my countrymen on behalf of the persecuted African, I find in the fact a reward for all the sufferings, in character and person, which I have endured in the cause as a missionary for the last eight years … All I ask is, that my African brother may stand in the family of man; that my African sister shall, while she clasps her tender infant to her breast, be allowed to call it her own.[28]

Because of the work of abolitionists like Knibb, building on the successes of William Wilberforce, Parliament declared the end of slavery in all British territories. The Jamaican parliament placed a condition of a 6-year apprenticeship of slaves with their former owners, before attaining total freedom. This arrangement was later abandoned and in 1838 the slaves received total freedom. In Jamaica, William Knibb played an active part in the subsequent local revivals that took place, from 1838 to 1845. During those 7 years 22,000 former slaves were baptized, with 20 missionaries being involved, and with William Knibb baptizing 6,000. He also translated the Bible into the language of the former slaves, Creole. During his time in Jamaica, William Knibb was personally associated with the founding of 35 churches, 24 missions, and 16 schools. He died in 1845 at the age of 42, and was buried at the

[27] Hinton, *Memoir of William Knibb*, p. 172. The slave trade had been abolished in Britain, but slavery in British territories continued.
[28] Hinton, *Memoir of William Knibb*, pp. 154-155.

Baptist Falmouth Church. Nearly 8,000 Jamaicans attended his funeral. [29] It is clear in the case of Knibb, as with Carey, that evangelism and social change were bound together. It is also the case that Knibb cooperated with those outside the Baptist community to achieve his aims.

C. American Baptists and Slavery

During the time of both Carey and Knibb, the question of slavery was an issue for the Baptists in the United States as well as in Britain. In 1833, a number of Baptist ministers in London sent a letter to the Foreign Missions Board of the Baptist General Convention in Boston, USA. The English Baptists spoke of how they were encouraged by the work and witness of the Baptist missionaries in Jamaica, especially with regard to the emancipation of slaves. Dr. Bolles, for the American Foreign Mission Board, responded to the English Baptists, explaining that the American Baptist Convention could not interfere with what was taking place in North America on the issue of slavery. He attempted to outline the political situation and the limitations in respect of the American Congress, comparing that to the way the British parliament was able to take action concerning slavery in the British territories. He also mentioned that he believed that most Southerners did not think slavery was right, but that it was part of the economic and political structure they inherited, and one day it would phase out. He went on to say: "We have the best evidence that our slave-holding brethren are Christians, sincere followers of the Lord Jesus….We cannot, therefore, feel that it is right to use language or adopt measures which might tend to break the ties that unite them to us in our General Convention and in numerous other benevolent societies."[30]

Here it can be seen how the issue of slavery was being dealt with differently in Britain and the United States. Eventually the slavery issue divided the North and the

[29] ibid, p. 526
[30] William Weight Barnes, *The Southern Baptist Convention 1845-1953* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1954), p. 21

South politically, ending in the Civil War. This issue also divided the churches, including Baptist churches, causing a rift between the Christians of the North and South, but also the South and British Christians. The American Southern states were very dependent upon the use of slaves to produce their crops. Much of the economy was built on slave labour. A theology was promoted in the South, including among Baptists, that allowed Christians to enslave Africans. Scott Foutz, in his article "Theology of Slavery: Western Theology's role in the Development and Propagation of Slavery",[31] shows how slavery has been addressed in Western church history. Leo P. Hirrel also points out: "For all of its offensive features, slavery had been justified since antiquity by the necessity of preserving the social order in the face of human iniquity.'[32] Foutz gives attention to the theology which was developed that supported Christians having slaves. This theology's main text was Genesis 9:25-27, which is the story of Noah and his sons. Noah curses Ham and blesses Shem and Japheth. Ham is identified as being black; therefore for these white Christians Africans are by providence of God destined to be slaves. This Antebellum evangelical theology would justify slavery.

Another argument that was present among some European and American whites was that the Africans were lacking the intellectual abilities possessed by whites: "Gradually, scientific concepts of race incorporated popular notions about Africans' intellectual inferiority and theories about distinctive black religious capacity became the lens through which blacks were judged as fit or unfit for participation and inclusion in the nation."[33] In Thomas Virgil Peterson's book, *Ham and Jepheth*, he writes about this paradox:

> In the thirty-year period before the Civil War, Southerners, whose fathers and grandfathers had proclaimed the Enlightenment doctrines of natural

[31] *Quodlibet Journal*, Vol. 2, Number 1, January 2000
[32] Leo P. Hirrel, *Children of Wrath* (Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1998), p.135
[33] Curtis J. Evans, *The Burden of Black Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.6

> rights and human equality, constructed a meaningful universe that incorporated and sustained black subordination.[34]

Baptists had been present in the American colonies since the 1630s and by the end of the eighteenth century had grown significantly both in the North and South. The first two Baptist churches were established in 1639, one in Providence by Roger Williams, and the other in Newport by John Clarke.[35] The first Baptist church in the Southern colonies was in Charleston, South Carolina, established by William Screven around 1686.[36] The two Great Awakenings, 1725-1750 and 1795-1835, had a positive effect within the Baptist movement and the Baptist congregations spread and grew.[37] However, by the mid-19th century, numerous social, cultural, economic, and political differences existed among Baptists - business owners of the North, farmers of the West, and planters of the South. The most divisive conflict linked slavery and missions.[38] Underlying this was the question of whether mission could be undertaken divorced from social issues.

Division took place among Baptists in America in 1845. The Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) was established in that year, because the Baptist Home Mission Society took one view about slavery: it would not accept missionaries that were slave owners. The Southern States took offence and withdrew from the Society. William B. Johnson, president of the South Carolina Baptist Convention, compared this to the division that happened between Paul and Barnabas, which was bitter but resulted in "two lines of service" being opened "for the benefit of the churches". [39] Johnson had attended the meeting in 1814 that had formed the Baptist General Missionary Convention, and at one point was the president of it. Johnson then

---

[34] Thomas Virgil Peterson, *Ham and Jepheth* (Metuchen, N.J. & London: The Scarecrow Press & the American Theological Library Association, 1978), p. 1
[35] Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001, pp. 56-57
[36] William H. Brackney, *Baptists in North America* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), p.15
[37] William G. McLoughlin, *Modern Revivalism* (New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1959), p. 8
[38] Robert A. Baker, *The Southern Baptist Convention and its People 1607-1992* (Nashville, TN,: Broadman Press, 1974), p. 159
[39] ibid

became the first President of the Southern Baptist Convention. There were many Southern churches that were fiercely independent. Co-operation even among Baptists was problematic, let alone with other denominations. SBC leaders struggled with "how to unite independent churches for effective denominational functions without violating their autonomy or the relationship of the individual church to the denomination."[40] The SBC chose a structure "that was more centralized, more connectional, and more cooperative than any heretofore known among Baptists anywhere, in Europe or America. They forsook the decentralized, societal approach of the North and formed one convention with two boards, home and foreign."[41] Their concern in all this was not social change.

The voices of men like William Carey and William Knibb in the early nineteenth century spoke out about the evil of structures in society, such as the slave trade, which oppressed other human beings. But many American Christians, including many Baptists as well as other evangelicals, did not see slavery as something evil that was to be addressed. For them the structures of the churches appeared to be of more consequence than evil structures in society. Not all Baptists, it is clear, have seen the gospel and social issues as linked. The Southern Baptist approach, however, was not one that most other Baptists wanted to follow.

D. The Evangelical Alliance and social issues

In Liverpool, England, from October 1st to 3rd, 1845, a meeting of evangelical leaders was held. It was here that a short evangelical statement of belief was formulated, as followed:

1. The divine inspiration, authority and sufficiency of Holy Scripture.
2. The unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of persons therein

[40] ibid, p. 164
[41] Walter B. Shurden, *Not An Easy Journey: Some Transitions in Baptist Life* (Macon, GE: Mercer University Press, 2005), p.138

3. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall.
4. The incarnation of the Son of God and his work of atonement for sinners of mankind.
5. The justification of the sinner by faith alone.
6. The work of the Holy Spirit in the regeneration and sanctification of the sinner.
7. The right and duty of private judgement in the interpretation of Holy Scripture.
8. The divine institution of the Christian ministry and the authority and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.[42]

This list of beliefs became an important foundational statement in the historic meetings in London in 1846 at which the Evangelical Alliance was formed. At these 1846 meetings, J.W. Massie, who was a shaping figure, referred to the fact that the statement was meant to be a "selection and not a compendium of scriptural truth",[43] one which highlighted the understanding of what it meant to be an evangelical. At the 1846 meetings, which were international, the American delegation insisted that a ninth article be added because of the rise of Unitarianism in America. This stated belief in:

9. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked.[44]

For several days the Alliance conference went well, but on the ninth day the topic of slavery and slave-holding was brought up, and this divided opinion. The problem was partly related to how the Alliance was to be formed. Was this new body to be formed as independent regional alliances – a series of bodies - or as a worldwide

[42] Ian Randall and David Hilborn, *One Body in Christ: The History and Significance of the Evangelical Alliance* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2001), pp. 41-42
[43] ibid. p. 49
[44] ibid. pp. 49-50

Alliance? If it was the latter, John Howard Hinton stated that he would take no part in an Alliance that accepted slave owners. The issue of slavery was very hotly debated. F.A Cox, another well-known British Baptist, suggested that social evils such as "the profanation of the Lord's day, intemperance, duelling, and the sin of Slavery" should be passed for consideration to the Alliance Branches, "trusting that they will study to promote the general purity and the Christian honour of this Confederation, by all proper means". He then added:

> And, in respect especially to the system of Slavery, and every other form of oppression in any country, the Alliance are unanimous in deploring them, as in many ways obstructing the progress of the Gospel; and express their confidence, that no Branch will admit to Membership slaveholders, who, by their own fault, continue in that position, retaining their fellow-men in slavery, from regard to their own interest.[45]

At first it seemed that this formula would allow for those who had disagreements still to unite in a worldwide Evangelical Alliance. But there were objections from several British and Irish delegates, not only Hinton, to having any association with slave owners. There were also those, on the other side of the argument, who suggested it was improper to single out the social evil of slavery, which was basically pointing to the Southern States of America. It was, they argued, making a political point which was outside the scope of the Alliance.

The American delegation was quiet during the discussions and at first seemed willing to accept the above statement from Cox, but after pondering the statement overnight, they withdrew support. [46] As a result a worldwide Evangelical Alliance was not to be, and there were also continuing debates about the hope expressed by the American Robert Baird to "set forth a brief statement of doctrine…a symbol of

[45] *Evangelical Alliance - Report of the Conference 1846* (London, Partridge and Oakey, 1847), pp. 40-41.
[46] ibid., p. 42

faith, in which all evangelical Protestants could unite."[47] It seemed possible for different denominations to overcome their doctrinal differences, but this one ethical obstacle could not be overcome. "British evangelicals were not prepared to relegate what they saw as a massive social evil, slavery, to a position of relative unimportance. American evangelicals refused to accept the British position, seeing it as arising from ignorance of their situation." [48] Instead several autonomous evangelical organizations would be formed, each within a country, which in turn would be part of district. The Alliance would be made up of at least 6 districts. The British would not be part of a district that permitted slave owners to join. But when the issue of someone owning shares in a slave-owning company came up, the topic was dropped, for many British owned shares in those types of companies.[49]

The concern for action continued to be a feature of the Evangelical Alliance in the nineteenth century. Ernest Payne notes that it was a Baptist, Edward Steane, who had "the lion's share in shaping the constitution of the Alliance and a chief part in its early administration".[50] Edward Steane was also the Evangelical Alliance leader who gave most attention to the cause of religious liberty for Baptists and others across Europe. He was especially active in the period from the 1850s to the 1870s and he is an example of someone who had the wider vision of cooperation and active involvement in social issues. Steane studied at Bristol Baptist College and at the University of Edinburgh – Oxford and Cambridge universities were still not open to Nonconformists. He became pastor of Denmark Place Chapel, Camberwell, London, and along with this was one of the secretaries of the Baptist Union, editor of the *Baptist Magazine*, a secretary of the Evangelical Alliance and editor of the Evangelical Alliance's paper, *Evangelical Christendom*.[51] Steane travelled widely across Europe, sometimes with John Howard Hinton, gathering information about religious persecution. He took up the cause of Baptists and also of others, such as a

[47] Randall and Hilborn, *One Body in Christ*, p.135
[48] ibid., p. 69
[49] ibid., p. 67
[50] E.A. Payne, *The Baptist Union: A Short History* (London: Baptist Union, 1959), p. 82.
[51] Ian Randall, *Religious Liberty in Continental Europe: Campaigning by British Baptists, 1840s to 1930s* (Oxford: Whitley Publications, 2012), pp. 1-2.

middle-aged Italian Protestant couple, Francesco and Rosa Madiai, who had been accused of heresy and condemned to four years of hard labour. Steane approached the British government and the pressure that was exerted led to the release of the couple.[52]

To what extent was the Evangelical Alliance an 'ecumenical' organization? It is said that the first time that the word 'ecumenical' was used it described "an attitude rather than a fact" – a "sense of already belonging to a world-wide unity of the Church of Christ, which transcends national and confessional difference". [53] This is the use that was made of the term by French Reformed Pastor Adolphe Monod, who was at the 1846 inaugural meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in London. Others who used the word 'ecumenical' in this sense while at the conference or in related discussions also used the word 'catholic'. However, they were not seeking structural church unity. "The Alliance began by seeking to establish evangelical unity among individuals rather than church denominations. By contrast, the World Council of Churches (WCC), from its commencement in 1948, has pursued structural and institutional unity among the historic denominations."[54] The Alliance was also concerned from its beginnings to engage in concerted evangelical action, as seen in the case of Steane and campaigning for religious liberty. This was attractive to Baptists.

[52] Ibid., p. 11.
[53] Ruth Rouse, and Stephen Neill, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* (London: SPCK, 1954), appendix 1, p. 738
[54] Randall and Hilborn, *One Body in Christ*, , p. 10

Chapter III
Evangelical and Ecumenical

In this chapter I want to trace developments that have evangelical and ecumenical elements, covering a period from the later nineteenth century up to the Lausanne, Manila and Cape Town Conferences. In the later nineteenth century an influential figure who promoted evangelical cooperation, evangelism and social action was D.L. Moody (1839-1899). In 1923, nearly 25 years after Moody's death, *The Christian Century* asked the question: "who were the true heirs of Moody?" [55] Both liberals and fundamentalists had claimed him. However, one must recognize that the division between the two groups was not as sharp in the 1880s and 90s. Grant Wacker writes: "The relationship between liberals and evangelicals in the 1880s and 1890s is best understood, not as a confrontation between aliens, but as a contest – albeit a deadly serious contest – between siblings who perceive and define the issues in remarkably similar ways."[56] Moody is very important, but I will devote more time to someone who was influenced by Moody, John R. Mott, since he bridges from the nineteenth century into the twentieth century, and I will also look at the Baptist, Walter Rauschenbusch. In this story the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910 is a turning point. The chapter will trace evangelical developments but will make special reference to Baptists.

A. John Mott: unity in evangelism

John Mott was born in 1865 into a Methodist family and at age 13 he came to Christ at a YMCA interdenominational revival meeting. At Cornell University, in January 1886, he was convinced God had called him to work "in His vineyard". A few days later J.E.K. Studd, one of the famous British 'Cambridge Seven' missionaries to China,

[55] Timothy George, *Mr. Moody and the Evangelical Tradition* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), p. 28
[56] Grant Wacker, 'The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Age in American Protestantism, 1880-1910', as quoted in Christopher E. Evans, *The Kingdom is Always but Coming* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2004), p. 42

came to Cornell. This was "the decisive hour" in Motts's life, when in conversation with Studd he was led to "a reasonable and vital faith" in Christ. Perhaps the encounter with Studd simply confirmed what Mott had already concluded a few days before. We do know that this particular week was a decisive one for Mott's ministry.[57] In his biography of Mott, Hopkins points out that one reason Mott chose Cornell was that he read about Cornell's founder's philosophy, which was a call for a new and better civilization, resisting the increasing materialistic and 'mercantile' spirit that was growing. Hopkins suggests that the seeds of 'social gospel thought' were part of Mott's thinking from his twenties.[58]

Mott attended D.L. Moody's Summer Conference at Mount Hermon in summer 1886, and was one of 100 students who volunteered for world mission. This impetus developed two years later into the Student Volunteer Movement (SVM) for Foreign Mission. Mott became SVM chairman in that year, 1888, continuing in this role for 32 years.[59] Mott had a high regard for Moody, who once said: "The world has yet to see what God will do with a man who is wholly consecrated to him." Unswerving devotion to Christ became Mott's overriding motivation.[60] Mott also saw in Moody the power of unity in Christian effort – the 'ecumenical' dimension. In addition, Mott took from Moody a desire to reach those who were needy and to offer practical help. Mott's understanding of philanthropy - making "the release and use of money a pronouncedly spiritual process" - was derived from Moody.[61] Mott became responsible for the annual Northfield Summer Conference along with Moody. In the 1890s the leading Baptist figure who spoke at Northfield was F.B. Meyer, a British Baptist influenced by Moody who combined commitments to evangelism, spiritual renewal and social reform. It was in 1891 that Meyer made his first trip to North America, invited by Moody to speak at Northfield. Meyer was judged a huge success,

[57] C. Howard Hopkins, *John T. Mott* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), pp. 21-22
[58] ibid., p. 13
[59] ibid., p. 27
[60] Ibid., p. 104
[61] ibid., p. 105

being seen as a profound mystic and as thoroughly practical.[62] Evangelism, spirituality and social change were being connected.

John Mott went to a meeting of the American Evangelical Alliance in 1889. The promoter, Josiah Strong, was someone he was familiar with, since he had followed Strong's social gospel writings. The participants were from sixteen denominations and 23 States, and they heard about church cooperation and the social gospel. A year later, building on connections, Mott became the Senior Student Secretary of the YMCA, seeking to develop an ecumenical movement of young lay people rather than being ecclesiastically orientated. From 1888 to 1891, 321 of the thousands of Volunteers in the USA and Canada went overseas. It was also during this period that the SVM motto Watchword began to be used: "The Evangelization of the World in this Generation". Motto declared this was the SVM's "ultimate purpose and its inspiration."[63] There has been debate about the origins of the motto. One likely source is a Baptist one. In 1871 Joseph Angus, Principal of Regent's Park College in London, addressed the BMS on 'Apostolic Missions'. He asked: "In ten or twenty years can repentance and remission of sins be preached through Christ to all nations?" After setting out what could be possible, he concluded: "It can be done." Arthur T. Pierson, the American missionary statesman, asked Angus to reprint his talk, and Pierson suggested that it was from Angus' address that the SVM motto came.[64] In 1904 Mott said: "Some of the greatest discourses ever preached were missionary sermons which bear the marks of exhaustive preparation; for example…'Apostolic Missions' by Joseph Angus."[65]

---

[62] I.M. Randall, *Spirituality and Social Change: The Contribution of F.B. Meyer (1847-1929)* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2003), pp. 96-99; A. T. Pierson, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century* (New York: Funk and Wagnall's Co., 1900), p. 160; G. M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 249, footnote.

[63] Hopkins, *Mott*, p. 89

[64] I.M. Randall, *'Conscientious Conviction': Joseph Angus (1816-1902) and Nineteenth-Century Baptist Life* (Oxford: CHHH Occasional Papers, 2010), p. 22, citing Joseph Angus, *Apostolic Missions: The Gospel for Every Creature*, (London, 1892, new edn.), p. 4.

[65] J.R. Mott, *The Pastor and Modern Missions: A Plea for Leadership in World Evangelization* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement, 1904), pp. 67-8.

During the 1890s Mott visited universities and colleges in America and Canada. Using the image of electric power, it has been said that through Mott, inspirational power ran "from the central dynamo through a web of connections that became a world network."[66] It was in Sweden in 1895, when John Mott was there with his wife Leila, that the World Student Christian Federation (WCSF) was established. It opened up the international Christian Student movement to include not just Protestants, but also Orthodox and Catholic members. Mott became General Secretary. A world tour Mott made in the period 1896-98 laid the foundation for Mott's ability to gather together so many people to the 1910 Edinburgh Conference (see below). During that tour the Motts met 1,300 missionaries representing over 80 different mission agencies.[67] In 1900 an ecumenical missionary conference was held in New York. It attracted 170,000 people in total. This was the first time the word 'ecumenical' had been used in the title of a Christian conference. Mott was there, as was Timothy Richard, the creative Baptist missionary in China who argued for a more positive engagement with the Chinese culture.[68]

It is clear that in the period up to the early twentieth century Mott was a key figure committed to a united effort to reach the world with the Christian message. In 1898 Mott explained the SVM Watchword, 'The evangelization of the world in this generation", as meaning "to bring Christ within the reach of every person in the world that he may have the opportunity of intelligently accepting Him as a personal Savior", and added: "It is our duty to evangelize the world, because Christ has commanded it. His command to us applies to this, the one generation in all eternity for which we are responsible…"[69] Mott would often refer to the many conversions and rededications that took place at his meetings. In fact, when Mott was asked to say a word as he was leaving his last meeting of the World Council of Churches Assembly in Evanston, Illinois, in 1954, he said, "Gentlemen, when John Mott is dead,

[66] Hopkins, *Mott*, pp 82-83
[67] ibid., p. 203
[68] Randall and Hilborn, *One Body in Christ*, p. 150.
[69] Hopkins, *Mott*, p. 232

remember him as an evangelist."[70] He would encourage students to keep the 'morning watch' - daily Bible reading and time of prayer.[71] He stressed that reading the Bible daily was necessary for spiritual growth. He added, as the most important element, the study of the person of Jesus Christ.[72] In these respects Mott was a classic evangelist and evangelical teacher. At the same time, along with Baptist figures such as F.B. Meyer, he affirmed the necessity of social involvement.

B. The Social Gospel

There has been much debate about whether evangelicals have espoused a social gospel. John Clifford, in London, did so as early as the 1880s, and in the early twentieth century F.B. Meyer was an advocate of the "kingdom of social justice". As President of the British Baptist Union in 1906 Meyer's views were given considerable prominence.[73] Even better known as a promoter of the social gospel in this period was an American Baptist and theologian, Walter Rauschenbusch. His book, *Christianity and the Social Crisis,* published in 1907, made a powerful impact. In this book he wrote:

> Christianity certainly has more affinity for co-operation and fraternal institutions than for competitive disunion. It should therefore strengthen the existing communistic institutions and aid the evolution of society from the present temporary stage of individualism to a higher form of communism.[74]

Although this statement is not particularly theological, Rauschenbush did seek to grapple with theological issues. He stated:

---

[70] ibid., p. 701.
[71] ibid., p. 146
[72] ibid., p. 149
[73] Randall, *Spirituality and Social Change*, pp. 128-30.
[74] Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis in the 21st Century* (New York, HarperCollins Publishers, 2007), pp. 114-115. This edition is edited by Paul Raushenbush and has essay by various authors.

> In asking for faith in the possibility of a new social order, we ask for no Utopian delusion. We know well that there is no perfection for man in this life: there is only growth toward perfection. In personal religion we look with seasoned suspicion at any one who claims to be holy and perfect, yet we always tell men to become holy and to seek perfection. We make it a duty to seek what is unattainable. We have the same paradox in the perfectibility of society. We shall never have a perfect social life, yet we must seek it with faith….The Kingdom of God is always but coming.[75]

Rauschenbusch was a pastor in an area of New York city called Hell's Kitchen. In his ten years of ministering with the poor and suffering, he felt that his inherited theology failed to give him an answer to the inequities he saw in society. The gospel he had been taught emphasized personal salvation, but what about the poor in society? Rauschenbusch could agree with Karl Marx's analysis of the problem of modern industrialized society and with the way Marx pointed out the economic exploitation of workers, but Rauschenbusch did not agree either with Marx's hostility towards Christianity or with the use of violence to bring about social change. He believed that the real message of Christianity had been lost and he felt he had rediscovered it through his own study of the Bible. He created a theology that placed an emphasis on the Kingdom of God and on the responsibility of Christians to be part of God's solution by being engaged in social reforms which would bring about a more just and equal society. The 'Christianization' of society was the ultimate goal.[76]

This was, for some, a very provocative message. From 1908 in particular, Rauschenbusch became a very popular speaker at YMCA conferences, conventions and colleges around the USA.[77] This seems to have been the time, Addison argues,

---

[75] Ibid., p. 337
[76] For Rauschenbusch's life and work see Evans, *The Kingdom is Always but Coming* (2004).
[77] ibid., p. 208

when the social gospel began to have an influence on the SVM.[78] Rauschenbusch's book, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, soon became a best seller. As possible evidence of the influence of Rauschenbusch's thinking, Mott issued this challenge to students and YMCA members in 1908:

> Jesus Christ is Lord and therefore must reign. He only has authority to rule social practices. He must dominate His followers and all society in all their relationships: domestic, industrial, commercial, civic, national, and international…There are no two gospels, one social and one individual. There is but one Christ who lived, died, and rose again, and relates Himself to the lives of men. He is the Savior of the individual and the one sufficient Power to transform his environment and relationships. The Association is summoned imperatively to give itself more fully than heretofore to discharge its social responsibility. It is summoned by the program and two great commandments of Jesus Christ.[79]

In 1914 Mott invited Walter Rauschenbusch to be one of the speakers at the national student conference in the USA and to speak on social needs. The message was reported in the *Student World* as "a summons to penitence for our share in the corporate sins of society and to a new faith, a new order, a new devotion of service."[80]

In the same year, Mott wrote a book, *The Present World Situation* (published in 1915), in which there is a strong emphasis on the need for social reform by the Christianization of society. Mott seems to have taken Rauschenbusch's argument seriously and he called on Americans to live out Kingdom of God principles, which are seen as socialistic. He asks how missionaries from the West, the civilized world, could go to non-Christian nations and preach Christ and his kingdom, if at home in

[78] Steve Addison, Embracing Another Gospel, www.movements.net/?s=embracing+another+gospel, 16 December 2009
[79] Hopkins, *Mott*, p. 276
[80] ibid., p. 418

America there was materialism, injustice, inequality and poverty. He talks about the response of non-Christians when "they see for themselves the shocking practical denials of Christ in our commercial, industrial, social and political practice". Mott suggested that they cannot but say, "Christianity cannot drive out these devils in the lands where it has long be prevalent" - so why should we believe it? [81] Neither Mott nor Rauschenbusch ever denied the importance of having a personal faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord; they embraced an evangelical spirituality. Hopkins describes Mott as an evangelical liberal.[82] His evangelical spirit is seen in the following statement:

> The many regular and established methods of missionary work, education, medical, literary, philanthropic, are right and should be employed as convincing expressions of the unselfish and constructive spirit of Christ, but it is not the expression or illustration of the spirit of Christ which converts and transforms men, but the living Christ Himself.[83]

Yet Mott was concerned that the message was not being presented in a way that was relevant to the world. It seemed that the gospel was not making a difference. Perhaps he saw in Rauschenbusch's approach a way of making the gospel more applicable to this world situation. "At times", he stated, "we may seriously question whether we have a Christianity worth propagating over the world."[84] There was a tendency in the early twentieth century to change the SVM priority from evangelism to the Christianization of society. However, Mott's view was that "it is an idle dream to talk of society becoming Christian if the individual is not. They are inseparably associated."[85]

---

[81] John R. Mott, *The Present World Situation* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1915), p. 120
[82] Hopkins, *Mott*, p. 629
[83] ibid., pp. 213-14
[84] ibid., p. 227
[85] ibid., p. 624

In looking at the social gospel it is important that it is not seen as being in opposition to the gospel of personal salvation. Meyer, Rauschenbusch and Mott would all have rejected such a contrast. They saw the need to work for social change as well as seeking spiritual renewal. In this there was a commitment, seen especially in Mott with his SVM work and in Meyer with his Free Church cooperative endeavours, to work with others. Some evangelicals disagree with the lack of a doctrinal statement in the SVM to define a common faith to form a basis for Christian unity, although such a statement was part of the Evangelical Alliance. Questions about evangelicals being caught up in the ecumenical movement led to some evangelicals seeing anything ecumenical as being liberal. Yet I would argue that when looking back one can see a direct line from the Northfield Summer Conference of 1886 to the emerging ecumenical movement. John Mott was the driving force behind the ecumenical movement, and he tried to hold united evangelism and social action together.

C. Edinburgh World Missionary Conference 1910

The Edinburgh 1910 Conference was the "Third Ecumenical Missionary Conference". The first was in 1888 in London, and the second was in 1900 in New York. It was proposed that the third be in Scotland. On 29 January 1907, the Scots agreed to host the conference in June 1910 and began to arrange the sending out of invitations. At that time 'ecumenical', in their context, meant taking the gospel to the whole world. The Scots set up a committee to organize the conference and J. H. Oldham was chosen to be on the committee. It turned out to be a crucial appointment.[86] Oldham was 30 years of age, and was by far the youngest among the other men on the committee, most of whom were in their 70s and 80s. Oldham had several years experience with the ecumenical spirit of the Student Christian Movement (SCM) and the World Student Christian Federation, while dong missionary work in India. He recognized that John Mott should be consulted in

[86] For Oldham, see Keith Clements, *Faith on the Frontier: A life of J.H. Oldham* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999).

helping to plan this upcoming conference. So in January 1908 Oldham met with Mott at the Liverpool Student Volunteer Movement conference. Mott could see the importance of having a planning committee for the 1910 conference that was not just British, but more international. Mott suggested that the 1910 conference focus should be on "study and consultation by the leaders of the foreign missionary forces of the world concerning the large and most vital questions of missionary opportunity and policy."[87]

John Mott, as Secretary to the YMCA and the WSCF, had (as has been seen) made connections with national and international Christian leaders all over the world. He offered his opinion about how he thought the 1910 conference could be most helpfully organized. He was given a key role in proposing how the committees should operate. When the organizing committee met, virtually everything went as Mott had planned, but with one addition. In order for the Anglican Church to participate, the Anglicans said there was not to be a doctrinal statement that had to be agreed.[88] As we will see later, this issue has been the source of criticism from many evangelicals of the 1910 Conference. However, as Brian Stanley points out, Edinburgh 1910 was "a decidedly Protestant and broadly evangelical gathering". He says:

> The World Missionary Conference was in fact more seriously limited in its scope than its formal title or the ascription 'ecumenical' implies. It hardly needs to be said that the conference was representative of only one, albeit broad, segment of the world Christian community. It was a decidedly Protestant and broadly evangelical gathering, the principal exceptions being those amongst the thirty-five members of the High Church Society for the

[87] Brian Stanley, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2009), p. 25
[88] Hopkins. *Mott*, p. 346

> Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) who would have regarded themselves as Anglo-Catholic rather than Protestant.[89]

A significant limitation was that Latin America was excluded from the regions to be considered as fields of mission. Again, Stanly comments:

> …the Pacific islands of Polynesia and Micronesia, the continent of Latin America, and the Caribbean were all substantially excluded from the terms of reference of the conference on the grounds that they were, like Europe or North America, deemed to be part of the territorial entity known as Christendom, and hence beyond the horizons of Christian mission. That was part of the deal struck by the organizers of the conference with the leaders of the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Church of England… there would have been no Anglo-Catholic attendance at all if the conference had been permitted to discuss Protestant missions to Roman Catholic territory. Anything that looked like evangelical proselytism of Catholic or Orthodox adherents was necessarily off limits. The issue of religious proselytism that is now so hotly and widely debated first surfaced in international Christian argument in 1909-10.[90]

Although topics of a doctrinal nature werenot to be discussed during the conference, as above noted the vast majority of those who were invited to participate were of the evangelical persuasion. Baptists were supportive of the conference and of Mott as an individual. In 1905 the *Baptist Missionary Magazine* of April 1905 wrote that Mott's principles were "so scriptural", his plans "so reasonable", and it went on to say that he "produces deep conviction, sturdy resolution, inspiration to heroic sacrifice".[91] The BMS leadership contributed to the planning of the conference. On the question of social action, the conference took the view that action for justice

[89] Stanley, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910*, pp. 9-10
[90] ibid, p. 13
[91] Hopkins, *Mott*, p. 280, citing the *Baptist Missionary Magazine*, April 1905, p. 167.

might be a part of the missionary's work but it held that missionaries should not be involved in local politics.[92]

Twenty years after the 1910 Conference, an ecumenical movement created in large part by the conference had taken shape, and this eventually developed into the formation of the World Council of Churches in 1948. However, there were many evangelicals who had been sympathetic to the vision of Edinburgh 1910 who were not convinced about the WCC. Thus Kik wrote about misgivings of the evangelicals: "To what Christ will ecumenicity cleave?..... Some would point out that the question receives a sufficient answer in the WCC's formula, 'our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior'. Here the person of Christ is described as God and his function as Savior. The present theological climate demands a more definite and detailed answer. Every word in the formula has diversities of interpretation – some of which strike at the very foundation of Christianity."[93]

The term 'ecumenical' had been used quite happily by those within the Evangelical Alliance. From the 1940s it began to have a new meaning. It had first been used as a way to express the universality of the gospel to the whole world, but it began to have a new meaning, one which described an ecclesiastical unity of the various branches Christendom.

D. Lausanne 1974 and the Lausanne Movement

The Lausanne congress of 1974 was the idea of Billy Graham, a Baptist who by the later 1960s was acknowledged to be the world's leading evangelist. As a result of the 1966 World Conference on Evangelism in Berlin, which was partly sponsored by the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, and several regional conferences around the world in that period, Billy Graham sensed the need for a new and larger world congress on evangelism. He wrote to several evangelical leaders and asked if they

[92] Stanley, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910*, p. 260.
[93] J. Marcellus Kik, *Ecumenism and the Evangelical* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1958), pp. 10-11

agreed. They did. The decision was made to hold an International Congress for Evangelism in 1974. There was a clear agenda. It was to "be a working congress dealing with practical issues and strategies, spelling out the what, why and the how of world evangelism."[94]

'Let the Earth Hear His Voice' was the title of the conference, which was held in Lausanne, Switzerland, with 2,700 delegates attending. The title itself would seem to have set the focus on the proclamation of the gospel only, and this was to be strongly criticized by some evangelicals. Two Baptists from Latin America, Rene Padilla and Samuel Escabor, were leading voices asking for social issues to be addressed as part of the gospel. John Stott, who was the leader of Anglican evangelicals world-wide, spoke very directly to the congress, asking them to consider the criticisms and repent of their neglect of social responsibility. Here is the plea he made:

> It is not a servant role that we can find the right synthesis of evangelism and social action? For both should be authentic expressions of the service we are sent into the world to give… Here then are two instructions, 'love your neighbour' and 'go and make disciples.' What is the relation between the two? Some of us behave as if we thought them identical, so that if we have shared the Gospel with somebody, we consider we have completed our responsibility to love him. But no. The Great Commission neither explains, nor exhausts, nor supersedes the Great Commandment. What it does is to add to the command of neighbour-love and neighbour-service a new and urgent Christian dimension. If we truly love our neighbour we shall without doubt tell him the Good News of Jesus. But equally if we truly love our neighbour we shall not stop there … Love does not need to justify itself. It expresses itself in service wherever it sees need.[95]

---

[94] *The Lausanne Story* (Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, 1987), p. 12
[95] Timothy Dudley-Smith, *John Stott: A Global Ministry* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2001), pp. 211-212

This topic could have been very divisive, but the congress was willing to work through this challenge. John Stott and three others, including Samuel Escobar, were on the small committee put together to write the draft that would express the views of the congress. It was not an easy task. The draft was presented to the congress with the opportunity for comments and suggestions. John Stott then took two nights and made the final draft and by the end of the congress there was a Covenant which stated this:

> More than 2,700 million people, which is more than two-thirds of mankind, have yet to be evangelized. We are ashamed that so many have been neglected; it is a standing rebuke to us and the whole church….The goal should be, by all available means and at the earliest possible time, that every person will have the opportunity to hear, understand, and receive the good news. ….All of us are shocked by the poverty of millions and disturbed by the injustices which cause it. Those of us who live in affluent circumstances accept our duty to develop a simple life-style in order to contribute more generously to both relief and evangelism.[96]

Not all were in agreement with the statement, 400 of the 2,700 delegates, for one reason or another, did not sign. Also there was a group that did not like the suggestion regarding the primacy of evangelism over social action, and they formed a "Theology and Radical Discipleship Group" and produced a supplementary statement – which Stott spoke of appreciatively - that called for more social action.[97]

Billy Graham in his address to the congress, "Why Lausanne?", in giving a brief history of mission conferences, referred to John Mott and his involvement in the 1900 conference in New York. Graham quoted Mott: "The goal of the church was the conversion of souls and the edification of the infant churches." But for Graham

[96] J.D. Douglas, *Let the Earth Hear His Voice* (Minneapolis: World Wide Press Publications, 1975), p. 9.
[97] Dudley-Smith, *A Global Ministry*, p. 215

something happened after the great 1910 conference in Edinburgh, which eventually shifted the message from salvation for the individual to the material salvation of the community - the social gospel. Graham's view was that a split occurred in the missionary movement after Edinburgh, one direction being evangelical and the other ecumenical. He spoke of the New York and Edinburgh conferences as gatherings of leaders in evangelism and missions. He urged a focus on evangelism rather than 'everything else' the Church ought to be doing. His plea was that evangelicals would not make a mistake as was made in the past and lose their focus. "This is a conference of evangelicals. The participants were asked to come because you are evangelical – concerned with the evangelism and missions. We here tonight stand firm in the evangelical tradition of biblical faith."[98] It is clear that Graham did not want to stress social action as being on the same level as evangelism.

E. Manila 1989

The follow-up congress to Lausanne was held in Manila, in the Philippines, in July 1989. Over 3,000 people gathered, from about 170 countries. Out of this congress came the Manila Manifesto: This addressed the concern for verbal proclamation and also social concern as follows, in two of the twenty-one affirmations:

> 8. We affirm that we must demonstrate God's love visibly by caring for those who are deprived of justice, dignity, food and shelter.
>
> 9. We affirm that the proclamation of God's kingdom of justice and peace demands the denunciation of all injustice and oppression, both personal and structural; we will not shrink from this prophetic witness.

Later we have this statement: "We have again been confronted with Luke's

[98] Douglas, *Let the Earth*, p. 27

emphasis that the gospel is good news for the poor and have asked ourselves what this means to the majority of the world's population who are destitute, suffering or oppressed." The answer was strongly biblical. "We have been reminded that the law, the prophets and the wisdom books, all the teaching and ministry of Jesus, all stress God's concern for the materially poor and our consequent duty to defend and care for them. Scripture also refers to the spiritually poor who look to God alone for mercy. The gospel comes as good news to both." The statement continued with scripture references from the Gospels, 1 John and Acts: "The spiritually poor, who, whatever their economic circumstances, humble themselves before God, receive by faith the free gift of salvation. There is no other way for anybody to enter the Kingdom of God. The materially poor and powerless find in addition a new dignity as God's children, and the love of brothers and sisters who struggle with them for their liberation from everything which demeans or oppresses them."[99]

Rene Padilla, as noted, is one of those who have been critical of the 'traditional' evangelicals' 'dualism' between evangelism and social involvement. For him the idea of the 'primacy of evangelism' over social action is not acceptable. He contends,

> …that a more biblical concept of missions suggests that there is no evangelism without a social dimension, and there is no Christian social action without an evangelistic dimension. When that is acknowledged, it will make no sense to speak of 'the primacy of evangelism'; it is far better to emphasize the wholeness of mission - mission as including justification by faith and doing justice, faith and works, word and action; mission as addressing spiritual needs and physical and material needs, the personal and the social, the private and the public.[100]

[99] *The Manila Manifesto* (Pasadena, Calif.: Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, 1989), pp. 5, 11-12.
[100] C. Rene Padilla, *Mission Between the Times* (Carlisle: Langham Partnership International, 2010), p. 11

It did seem at Manila as if this emphasis by Padilla was acknowledged. The Manila Manifesto spoke of evangelical repentance: "We repent of any neglect of God's truth in Scripture and determine both to proclaim and to defend it. We also repent where we have been indifferent to the plight of the poor, and where we have shown preference for the rich, and we determine to follow Jesus in preaching good news to all people by both word and deed."[101] However, at Manila Valdir Steuernagel from Brazil gave a ten-minute speech making it clear that he and others felt that there was still a lack of attention being given to the question of justice.[102]

F. Cape Town 2010

These questions were again taken up at Cape Town in 2010 (the location and the date being related to Carey's call for a conference at Cape Town in 1810), under the heading "Christ our Reconciler". The Cape Town statement, section 10, has this:

> Evangelism itself is the proclamation of the historical, biblical Christ as Saviour and Lord, with a view to persuading people to come to him personally and so be reconciled to God…The results of evangelism include obedience to Christ, incorporation into his Church and responsible service in the world… We affirm that evangelism and socio-political involvement are both part of our Christian duty. For both are necessary expressions of our doctrines of God and humankind, our love for our neighbour and our obedience to Jesus Christ…The salvation we proclaim should be transforming us in the totality of our personal and social responsibilities. Faith without works is dead.

[101] *The Manila Manifesto*, p. 12.
[102] See Padilla, *Mission Between the Times*, p. 17

By this time the older ideas of evangelism and social responsibiluty were being referred to as 'integral mission'. The Cape Town wording reflected this development:

> Integral mission is the proclamation and demonstration of the gospel. It is not simply that evangelism and social involvement are to be done alongside each other. Rather, in integral mission our proclamation has social consequences as we call people to love and repentance in all areas of life. And our social involvement has evangelistic consequences as we bear witness to the transforming grace of Jesus Christ. If we ignore the world, we betray the Word of God which sends us out to serve the world. If we ignore the Word of God, we have nothing to bring to the world.'

Several commitments were made:

> We commit ourselves to the integral and dynamic exercise of all dimensions of mission to which God calls his Church.
>
> - God commands us to make known to all nations the truth of God's revelation and the gospel of God's saving grace through Jesus Christ, calling all people to repentance, faith, baptism and obedient discipleship.
> - God commands us to reflect his own character through compassionate care for the needy, and to demonstrate the values and the power of the kingdom of God in striving for justice and peace and in caring for God's creation.
>
> In response to God's boundless love for us in Christ, and out of our overflowing love for him, we rededicate ourselves, with the help of the Holy Spirit, fully to obey all that God commands, with self-denying humility, joy

> and courage. We renew this covenant with the Lord - the Lord we love because he first loved us.[103]

Here we see an attempt by evangelicals to place evangelism and social involvement as integral, to say that they are inseparable. It can be seen that there has been an attempt to end the on-going debate over 'primacy', at least in the statement from Cape Town.

Baptists have not spoken with one voice in the period examined in this chapter. However, it is significant that two Baptist figures, Walter Rauschenbusch and Rene Padilla, have been powerful prophetic voices calling for the gospel to be a gospel of transformation. The possible link between the visions of these two Baptists has not been explored. F.A. Tizon, in *Transformation after Lausanne*, has a section in which he looks at the roots of 'transformation' and he mentions Rauschenbush in a footnote in connection with the social gospel.[104] I have tried to explore here the linkage, especially through John Mott, between the missional ecumenism of Edinburgh 1910 and the vision of some of those in the Lausanne Movement who have a holistic vision of unity among evangelicals, evangelism and a social vision. For Baptists this vision goes back to William Carey.

[103] www.lausanne.org/en/documents/ctcommitment.html#pp. 1-8
[104] F.A. Tizon, *Transformation after Lausanne* (Oxford: Regnum Books. 2008), p. 23.

Chapter IV

Evangelism and Social Concern: Continuing Controversy

This chapter takes the story on from Cape Town 2010 and seeks to show the way in which debate about the topic of evangelism and social responsibility is continuing. A large part of this chapter is an interview I conducted with Lindsay Brown, who was co-chair of Cape Town 2010. Brown is a Baptist, and his views give insights into how someone who is a Baptist (living in the West) and is at the heart of the Lausanne movement is seeking to continue to address the issues being considered here. However, other Baptist and evangelical voices will also be looked at in this chapter.

A. Rene Padilla, John Piper and Cape Town

Rene Padilla has been a significant participant in all three Lausanne congresses. As we have seen, he has been one of the voices, beginning with Lausanne 1974, that has been pressing for the removal of the ideas of the 'primacy of the gospel' over social involvement. Padilla made this statement a few months before the Cape Town Conference:

> There is no place for a dichotomy between evangelism and social political responsibility: evangelism is done with social conscience because the good news of the kingdom of God is meant to affect the totality of life on both personal and a social level, and those who are evangelized are summoned to cooperate with other Christians in the fulfillment of the missionary task. On the other hand, social responsibility is exercised with an evangelistic conscience because the good works that are done are carried out in Jesus' name as visible signs of the kingdom of God that was brought into history by Jesus Christ. Something is missing when we serve our neighbor but refrain from giving an account of the hope that is in us and motivates our actions. On

> the other hand, something is also missing when we share our faith verbally but our faith does not work through love.[105]

The Cape Town Congress lasted 6 days. Each day began with a Bible study from Ephesians. On Day Three this was given by John Piper from the USA, who is a Baptist espousing a strongly Reformed position, teaching from Ephesians 3. In the course of his address Piper said this:

> I plead with you. Don't choose between the two truths. Embrace them both. It doesn't mean that we will all spend our time in the same way. God forbid. But it means we will let the Bible define reality and define love. Could Lausanne say – could the evangelical church say – we Christians care about all suffering, especially eternal suffering? I hope we can say that."

Piper went to argue that if evangelical Christians feel resistant to saying "especially eternal suffering", or resist saying, "We care about all suffering in this age", then either they have a defective view of hell or a defective heart. His prayer was this: "I pray that Lausanne would have neither."[106]

In his reflections after Cape Town, Padilla referred to this Bible Reading and stated that there is an "urgent need within the Lausanne movement to clarify theologically the content of the mission of God's people."[107] He saw Piper as having reiterated the position that God's people were "called to give priority to the evangelization of the lost". Padilla lamented that Cape Town did not allow time for serious theological reflection on these matters, despite the rich theological content, as he described it, of the Cape Town Commitment, which a working group had devoted a whole year to producing. [108]

---

[105] Padilla, *Mission between the Times*, pg. 20
[106] J.E.M. Cameron, *Christ Our Reconciler*, Inter-Varsity Press, Nottingham, 2012, pg. 84
[107] Padilla, 'The Future of the Lausanne Movement', *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, p. 87
[108] ibid.

B. Interview with Lindsay Brown

This interview took place at Interlaken, Switzerland, on 10 July 2012, at an International Baptist Churches Summer Conference. Lindsay Brown has been the General Secretary of the International Fellowship of Evangelical students (IFES) and he is currently International Secretary for IFES, training evangelists for university ministries. He lives in Wales and (as mentioned) is a Baptist. I had interviewed Lindsay Brown two days before, but because of a technical problem the recording was lost. Lindsay graciously gave me a second interview so I made a few comments to set the parameters for the second interview.

Lee Hanson:
We were talking about William Carey, William Knibb, all the way through the 1800s where you have English Baptists as a movement, a really strong anti slavery movement, and mission movements. Then we came to America and the slavery issue. The Evangelical Alliance was formed in 1846, but there was a serious split. They couldn't get together and make a world Alliance because of slavery in America, so they made regional Alliances.

Then we have D.L. Moody, the YMCA and Student Movement. Then we have his conferences at Mount Hermon, where he had the Cambridge Seven come over. John Mott was there and was one of those who volunteered to change the world for Christ. John Mott took on a leading role as an evangelist. In 1910 Mott was the one mainly responsible for the 1910 Edinburgh Missionary Conference, and then around 1914 a lot of evangelicals began to question if he was still as specific with the evangelical message. D.L. Moody's son questioned Mott and his followers: were they making too much of the 'social gospel' and forgetting evangelism? Mott said, 'I am just as strong in my principles of Christianity as you are'. But then you look at what happened to the student movement as it helped to form the World Council of Churches.

Then you have, coming up to now, the 1974 Lausanne Congress, with Billy Graham and John Stott. We have a reaction to the WCC, or a response … a move of Christians who think we need to keep the evangelical message alive. But also we have the issue of social action. So that is where we were talking about…

Lindsay Brown:
Well, first about the difference between the Student Volunteer Movement and the breakaway movement which I am part of, because IFES (International Fellowship of Evangelical Students) came into existence essentially as a breakaway movement from SVM - which was more the SCM in the UK - because they gradually lost their evangelical focus. They (SVM/SCM)… as a student ministry had student workers on the campuses, they emphasized evangelism, they emphasized discipleship, they emphasized mission. As far as I can tell reading the history (several books have been written about it) the main difference is that they never had a doctrinal basis. And that is I why I believe very strongly in having a clearly defined evangelical doctrine for our basis, which all our leaders sign. My own view is if our leaders are agreed on what constitutes primary central Christian doctrines, you have a better chance of holding things together.

Incidentally, that is why I think not even the Lausanne Covenant was enough, because it is not a historical evangelical doctrinal statement. It says nothing about, for example, justification by faith, which Luther said was the article of a standing or falling church. It is central in the history of all revivals. When you miss out on that, or you go wrong on that, then you have a deficient view of Christ, a deficient view of the nature of man, a deficient view of the nature of salvation, the lost-ness of man, and so on.

That is why I was given the responsibility of bringing together a group of theologians in 2008, one from each major region of the world, to draw up a summary of what evangelicals have always believed historically. And that is the first half of the Cape Town Commitment. My own view is that there has never been

a document in the history of the Church before which brings together both doctrinal substance and practice. What we often have is a call to action, or a doctrinal statement standing on its own. What you need actually, is you take the model of the Colossians and Romans, where Paul enunciates a great doctrine - 'the uniqueness of Christ' in Colossians, 'Justification by faith' in Romans. Then in the second half of each letter, he spells out the implications of how we live. So my own conviction is that you need both. When IFES came into existence in the early 1900s, it was because they realized that the SCM groups, that were in existence in Cambridge in particular, but in other universities, had lost their way doctrinally. The future son-in-law of C.T. Studd, Norman Grubb, who was a student at Cambridge at the time, asked the leaders of the SCM at Cambridge, 'is the death of Christ central in the message that you proclaim?' And he said, ' it not central, it is part of it, but it is not central.' He said,' We have a different message then". And that is how the Inter-Varsity Fellowship came together [and later IFES].

Now when it comes to John Mott's situation, I don't know enough about his own personal thinking. I haven't read his very big biography. Personally, I have often tried to look at him charitably; I thought that he was either naïve or herded into a decision. In the 1910 Conference they never discussed major doctrinal issues. If he was naïve, it was because he wanted to emphasis the visible unity of the church. But you can't actually do that unless you have some agreement on what the visible church believes. And for that you really need a doctrinal basis. He could have been herded into it, because when I talked with John Stott about this just before the Cape Town 2010 Congress, I expressed to him my concern that the 1910 Congress went wrong because they never discussed doctrine. John Stott actually said to me, 'Yes, I'm ashamed to say that it was the bishops in my own communion, the Anglican Church in the UK, who said that they would not come to the Edinburgh Congress if doctrinal issues were discussed.' And John Stott lamented that. Now how accurate that is (John Stott was usually pretty accurate historically) in terms of John Mott's relationship with those Anglican bishops, certainly he so wanted them to be present. Whether he adjusted the focus in order to accommodate them, or whether he shared

their conviction that doctrine often divides. … The Baptist Church I grew up in refused to have a doctrinal basis, and then when I was converted in my teens, I said to the pastor 'you'd be good to have a doctrinal basis.' 'What in the world would we do that for, doctrine just divides Christians'. Then I came across the song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32 verses 1and 2, where God says to Moses (in the King James Version), 'my Doctrine will fall like the dew in the morning, it refreshes.' The role of doctrine is not to bore us, or even to divide us. Sometime division is necessary when there is a lack of conviction about central truths. Also the purpose of doctrine is to spiritual refresh us. That was John Stott's take on the 1910 incident.

Whatever the motivation was with John Mott, it was in my view disastrous to the church, for it led to the demise of the Student Volunteer movement, which God had used to send out tens of thousands of students and young graduates to take the gospel across the globe. But they just lost it in the early 1900s. I think also of the 1910 Conference. I don't know whether to celebrate it or not, because it is probably true that it contributed to an acceleration of taking the gospel to places where it was not heard, but it also undoubtedly led to the creation of the World Council of Churches, which has sidelined the gospel, sadly, generally. There are some evangelicals, but by in large it was captured by a liberal theology coming out of continental Europe mainly. And to some extent John Mott is responsible for that. That is why in 2010 we insisted that what was needed was not a new Lausanne covenant, but we needed something that brought together doctrinal substance, to penetrate not only every area of the world geographically but also every sphere of society with the gospel. That was the thinking behind the Cape Town Commitment, which I think is a very good summary in the first half of what evangelicals have always believed is the essence of the Christian faith.

And actually, it's interesting, and perhaps we should write this up sometime in the future, that in preparation for that first half of the Cape Town Statement we called together a group of 18 theologians, of evangelical leaders around the world, and we ask them to look through some of the great statements in the history of the church

even going back as far as Nicaea, to see what these great leaders' arguments were about central truths. We asked them to try to highlight what they thought were the essential doctrines that evangelicals held to in most of the major councils in the history of the church. So we tried to look back even to the early centuries, and one of the things we discovered was that the term evangelical was used as early as the 2nd Century. I think it was Tertullian, about 180. The term was used in some of the correspondence in relation to the debates with the heretic Marcion who wasn't accepting most of the New Testament texts. And he defined the early Christians as evangelicals. That's important, because that shows that the term was used way before the existence of the Roman Catholic or the Orthodox churches, because they often say, we're 'johnny come lately's', it's just a reformation term, it's western, it's European. Actually it was a historic term used before Constantine, and the creation of the Roman Church.

LH: And so in your preparation for the Lausanne 3 in Cape Town, you had this conference in St. Paul …

LB: It was in John Piper's church in Minneapolis, yes.

LH: So you gathered these 18 theologians together to try to set up the way?

LB: It was theologians and evangelical leaders; some of them weren't academic theologians. John Piper was there, who is very sharp theologically, but of course he is a pastor and a preacher. There was the Archbishop of Sidney, Peter Jensen, who is a New Testament scholar. There was a New Testament scholar from Nigeria. There was a professor of systematic theology from China. There was the principal of the Presbyterian Seminary in Cairo. We divided the world in 12 regions and we asked people within each region: name for us one theologian who would find universal respect in your region, who you would like to nominate to come and help us work on this. The first Chair was Sinclair Ferguson who teaches in a Reformed seminary in the States, but he couldn't find the time to continue to work on the document,

after we had done the initial discussion, so Chris Wright took it over with a smaller group of theologians.

LB: Some people say, why didn't you debate and discuss this evangelical statement in Cape Town?

The reason we didn't do it was because we think evangelicals have great difficulty in agreeing on things, across the world. And what we wanted to do was actually to remind all those who came to Cape Town that these are the essential truths that evangelicals have always held over the last 2,000 years. And what we are doing is representing them to you, as those truths which the church holds, a church which aspires to be biblical. Because that's all evangelical Christianity is - a biblical Christianity. We present through the years what believers, biblical Christians, have believed all through the generations, since the first century, as a gift.

The main difference is that I think it's the first doctrinal statement in history written by evangelicals which is written in the language of love. There's an interesting story behind this. Chris Wright was driving his car from London down to John Stott's cottage in Wales, and he was chairing this think-tank and he was trying to think 'How can we put together doctrinal statement, which is fresh, when so many good doctrinal statements have been made over the years, over the generations. The World Evangelical Alliance has one. IFES has one which Martyn Lloyd-Jones was very proud of, which many agencies have copied, many mission agencies. As Chris Wright was reflecting as he was driving down, he thought 'Well the two great commandments are "Love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul mind and strength, and love your neighbour as yourself." If those are the greatest commandments, then our concern for truth should be couched in the language of love. So that's when he started thinking of the key statements, We love God the Father, We love God the Son, We love the Holy Spirit, We love God's word, We love God's world, We love God's people, so on. And this is how the document was framed.

Oozing out from love for God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the triune God, comes a concern for his truth and communicating his truth to the ends of the earth. So I think it's a beautiful, probably, my guess is, a historic document. In fact, a group of American missiologists have been working over the last year trying to fashion a one year M.A. missiology course which is based around the Cape Town commitments, on the theme of missions in the modern world.

LH: In my Dissertation I'm trying to deal with social concern and the gospel and how they relate. Can you give me your opinion or your insight or your observation of that conflict or dilemma or tension…

LB: Well first I think it's been a tension down the ages, and I don't think it will go away. Somebody said to me recently 'I thought that tension was dead'. It's not, because fresh challenges come in every generation, and each generation has to reaffirm what is central. And that's why I say, 'I was involved in Cape Town 2010'. It's up to the next generation of leaders to decide: do they think it's worthwhile for evangelicals around the world to gather together, to reaffirm their calling, their convictions and so on. One person said to me that the emphasis on public proclamation on the one hand and on ministries of compassion, or social engagement (whatever you want to call it) on the other are really like two wild horses, and the role of the leader is to hold the leads so you create a tension, and not allow the one horse to run off and take the chariot or the carriage in one direction and let the other horse go in the other.

And I think what that highlights to me - it's the role of leaders to challenge the church to compassionately and passionately engage in both these ministries. And in all of these things, I think our model is Jesus. And to put it rather crudely or simplistically, I think he gave us the model in the feeding of the five thousand. He preached to them first, if you want an order. His disciples then said to him, you preached to them, now send them away, which some modern people would say some evangelicals do - just preach to them and then send them off. But Jesus said

'no, feed them'. But he didn't only say 'feed them' either. He preached to them as well as feeding them. So we must do both. I think the model is there with Jesus. If you want to ask what has primacy, then it's hard to avoid saying that the proclamation has primacy, simply because evangelism and proclamation are dealing with eternal issues, and caring for people's physical well-being, though vitally important, has a temporal dimension. But it seems to me that in the example of Jesus and in the history of the church, the church is at its best when it does both.

I think the 19th century is one of the best examples, probably, when Evangelicalism was fairly strong in UK. You had preachers like Spurgeon who also set up his homes for orphans. You had the wealth of great preachers, but you also had Lord Shaftsbury and his Factory Acts, you had Wilberforce speaking out against the slave trade. And the interesting thing is, when you read Wilberforce's diaries his vision was actually to take the gospel to the Caribbean. But he realized 'I can't speak to these people authentically unless I also speak out against the slave trade, they won't listen to me unless I show I am concerned for their temporal well being.' It is actually out of a concern for the communication of the gospel that his concern for the abolition of the slave trade was born. So he saw the two as intertwined really.

Now I read a very interesting piece of correspondence between Martyn Lloyd-Jones and Philip Edgecumbe Hughes, the New Testament scholar in the States, on this very issue. And they were dialoguing about the interaction between evangelism and proclamation on the one hand and a ministry of compassion on the other, and specifically relating it to the Victorian generation in the 1800s. Lloyd Jones said is, 'What a lot of people do not realize is that there was a significant Christian consensus in the Victorian area, perhaps as many as 20% of the people were evangelicals, which is exceptionally high - it is about 1% in the UK now. He said, because you had a very strong evangelical consensus and a very significant minority who were also working from a Christian worldview even though they weren't converted, it was possible to fashion laws and execute changes in culture which were pleasing to God, off the back of the fact that lots of people were converted. And

Lloyd-Jones' argument was that if you are going to deal with the macro issues of engagement with society, you can't do it without being concerned about the micro transformation of countless thousands of individuals. Because when individuals are changed personally, they are converted, they become new men and women, they begin to have a concern for their families needs, the wider world, and so on. So Lloyd Jones said that if you want to see society changed and people exercise ministries of compassion, you've got to preach the gospel, so that people are converted.

When it comes to the discussion, if you like, of the apparent tension between presentations in recent international forums, some people even ask me where I stood after the Cape Town Congress on the disagreement between Ruth Padilla, who spoke about 'Social Engagement' one morning, and John Piper, who spoke about 'Proclaiming the gospel' the next morning. My own view is that it is really import to understand both of them from their own contextual situations. Ruth is living in El Salvador, which is one of the violent countries in the world. Huge numbers of people are just killed by some of the gangs there. It is a very difficult situation to live in. The Church is under pressure. And it is very hard to say in that situation you should just preach the gospel without having a concern for the poor… It would look strange.

John Piper's situation is slightly different - not that there are not the poor and those in need of compassion in North America, but one of the primary challenges the evangelical church faces in North America and Europe is theological liberalism, which has denuded the gospel of its power and denies the deity of Christ, his death, Christ's resurrection, justification by grace through faith, and all these things which are central doctrines. So what do you do in that situation? You've got to preach them, and it has got to be at the top of your list, you have to fight them. And sometimes you just have to fight.

That is why Harnack, the great German historian, said the two reasons the early church grew before Constantine were that they out-argued pagans and they out-lived them. So you have those two things together. From their context, if John Piper were living in El Salvador, I think his church would be running soup rooms and various other things, but he wouldn't play down preaching the gospel. He'd do both. If Ruth Padilla was living in North America, or in Europe with all the liberalism, paganism, secularism and materialism we deal with, as well as the hostility of the universities to the gospel, I'm sure she would want to demonstrate that the gospel is true, trustworthy and is superior to other world views. That is what we have to do in Europe. That is, incidentally, why I am leading a group of 50 university evangelists who just spend their time doing one week missions all across Europe. We're doing 25 in 25 countries in 25 cities in 25 months, at the moment. Because we see that our biggest challenge in Europe is the lack of passionate, convicting proclamation of the gospel, because many Christians have lost their nerve.

So there may be a tension between the two, but if I try to look at it charitably, I would try to see that they are both speaking out of concern, but also out of their own context. When we were in Minneapolis in John Piper's church, somebody said to him - you don't have a very strong social concern. He didn't answer this accusation at all, somebody else stepped in and said, 'I think you made a misjudgment of John there. I think he does have a concern for people's well being, and so on.' And then that evening, John invited us to his home. And I found out that all the royalties from his books go to different ministries, he and his wife have adopted a child from another culture, he doesn't live in a wealthy part of the city, and he reaches out to people who are disadvantaged, as well as others who come from wealthier backgrounds. I thought, 'no one can say that man does not have a combined passion to preach the gospel and a concern for people's physical well being.' And I think he summed it up beautifully, I can't remember the exact wording right at the end of his talk in Cape Town, but you can access it. I think this is a brilliant summary. He talked about the fact that if we do not have a concern to exercise compassion for people, we lack something of a human heart. But if we do not have a concern to preach the gospel,

then it is probably because we don't see the seriousness of hell and judgment. … So what he was trying to say was that actually both are very important, and that serious minded Christians really should be involved in both.

I would say there is one other document that is really worth reading. It is published in a series of books that comes out of St John's College, Nottingham, an Anglican theological College - Grove Booklets. It is a dialogue between Ron Snyder and John Stott about the whole issue of evangelism and social concern, or I prefer to use the term ministries of compassion - it has less heat in it. It is just a dialogue between the two, it must have been taped and published Ron Snyder seems to try and push John Stott to say which has primacy of the two. John Stott keeps coming back and saying I think the church must do two, the two, they are like two wings of a bird, they are like the two blades of a scissors. One is less effective without the other. But it is either someone else or Ron Snyder that keeps pushing him, saying which has primacy. And John said, oh well, if you want to say one has primacy it has got to be proclamation because it deals with eternal issues.

Social engagement, ministries of compassion, deal with the temporal, but I still think the church must be engaged in both. And I think that is a very helpful booklet. And I would want to say that John Stott is a model of an evangelical leader who kept those two things in creative tension right to the end of his life. He never lost his vision and passion for evangelism, he came and spoke at a conference I organized in Germany just a few years ago, a European evangelism conference for 2,500 students. And I remember him on the last night speaking about Timothy taking the gospel back to Asia Minor after everyone had deserted Paul. John Stott said, "I am old now, and you are young. And my last words to you are we need a new generation of Timothys. I've done what I could, but now in your generation you need many more to rise up and take the battle on from here'. He never lost that compassion and commitment to the proclamation of the Gospel. And I remember him saying to me, when he was in his 80s, 'You know if I were 40 years younger, I would join you working with students, in evangelistic work.' He said 'I realize that if you reach them and win

them to Christ, they get into so many different areas of society where they can exercise an effective testimony for Christ. And he himself led many university missions, I think over 50 of them, over a 25 year period, which really highlights his commitment to evangelism and proclamation. So I think he never lost it.

The unfortunate thing is, often when some leaders want to emphasis something because they think it is being underestimated by the church, they tend to over emphasize it and play down another area. And in my opinion, the other thing we need to be careful about is, especially as when we get older, that we do not become overly judgmental and embittered. We need to pray that God will continue to give us a softness of spirit, a gentleness towards other believers, but also real firmness, especially those in leadership, in terms of our commitment to vigorous and passionate evangelism, public proclamation of the gospel, as well as being engaged with people where they are.

I believe very much in ministries of compassion, I think they are needed to help people wherever they're in need. I want to leave 80 university evangelists behind me in Europe, so I have decided to give my own primary energies to both doing university missions and training university evangelists in Europe. Because I think a culture is only turned around when you win the argument in public, so I think we must engage in that. I think that's what happened in the Reformation and in the pre-Constantinian era with the early church fathers. There is one other book you should really try to get hold of, an outstanding book by Rodney Stark, professor of sociology at Washington University, Washington State I am not sure he was a Christian when he wrote it, but I believe he is a Christian in the Presbyterian church now. The book was on the theme of the Jesus Movement. How could a world-wide religion issue from a person who never wrote a book and never traveled more than a few miles? He was researching and writing as an academic sociologist. He basically argues in this very, very important book that it was the message that was critical. But he says there are two other primary factors which contributed to the growth of the church. He has written chapters on these areas. First, the treatment of

women: within the Roman Empire abortion was widely practiced, infanticide if girls were born, young brides of 12 were married off to guys who were 50. And if a man died his brothers could come into the house, take all the possession, and put the wife and children out on to the street. The church stood against all four of these practices and as a result many women came into the church and were converted. Actually it is a chapter that would makeanyone feel very proud as a Christian. It has nothing to do with women in leadership, the feminist movement, or anything like that. It was that they gave dignity, they cared for the women.

And the other was - he says that the early church Christians grew in staccato fashion, it wasn't a steady graph upwards. There was a plateau and two sharp periods of growth for the early church, round about 150 AD and 250 AD. These are – approximately - almost exactly the [time of the] two plagues in the Roman Empire. One was possibly early cases of measles, and the other cholera. One of them lasted 15 years. During these plagues many cities lost as many as a third or quarter of their inhabitants. The churches, however, because there was no social security or medical aid then, went out onto the streets and took people in and cared for them. Many elders and leaders died as a result but because of the ministry of the Christians, in exercising compassion for the people and saving some lives, losing some of their own, the church grew rapidly. Even the Roman Emperor said, 'We really have to match these Christians, because they are out-doing the pagans.' The Roman Emperor hated Christians. Julian was a Pagan Emperor who tried to restore paganism in the Roman Empire, and he could not bear the thought that these Christians were out-doing the pagans, in terms of their ministries of compassion. There is a brilliant letter written by one of the early bishops, which was read out on Easter Sunday Morning in congregations in Northern Africa in which he speaks, according to Rodney Star, of how many of our best elders and presbyters died exercising care for people in the streets. They are referred to as martyrs for the gospel .

The early church therefore shows us this inference. It's not just caring for believers, but caring for the needy and this was a means by which the church grew. They did not do that at the expense of proclamation. Some of them died because they were caring for people in the midst of the plagues, others died because they were preaching the gospel. So where do I stand on it - if you want primacy, it must be proclamation of the gospel. But our model must be Jesus. He both spoke to the 5000 and fed them. Where necessary we must do the same. Let Christian leaders who are concerned to show forth the work of Christ model that in leadership to those around us.

LH: Thank you very much.

C. Interview with Billie Hanks, Jr.

The interview was on 11 July 2012, in Interlaken. Billy Hanks, Jr, was born in 1944, in Texas. Billy was the first intern with the Billy Graham Evangelical Association and has been involved in disciple-making since that time. He is the founder and director of Operation Multiplication. His outlook is typical of many American evangelicals.

LH: I'm doing a study on evangelism and social responsibility. How do you see the connection between presenting the gospel verbally, presenting the gospel and telling people about Jesus, and also being concerned about their social conditions. Where there is the First World, as Rene Padilla would call it, and the 2/3rds world, the West is dominating the message , or forming the questions, and the 2/3rd world does not fit in, because they do not believe the gospel is meeting the social needs.

So how does the gospel meet the social needs?

BH: Well Lee, my perspective will be of course from my best understanding of the New Testament. I do not think the Lord left us, without a sense of direction on this. As to my understanding of the great Commission, number one, the last words Jesus

said to us in Acts 1:8&9 were that we should be his witnesses in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, and throughout the whole world.

Secondly, right at the end of his post-resurrection appearances, in his dialogue with the disciples, he told us that we were authorized to go out and make disciples of all nations. I do not think there is a born again believer, that I have ever met anywhere, I'm 68, that doesn't love people. I've never met a Christian who really loves God, who doesn't also love people. But I think a lot of people didn't love people before they loved God. They were selfish, self centred, everything in the world revolved round them. But whenever the world revolves around Christ's kingdom, and you seek him first, the Scripture says then these other things shall be provided for you. And I think that getting it in order, Christians should be equipped and should pray daily for opportunity to be salt and light, as we were told and do exactly what he told us to do. To be His witnesses, and to be prepared to give our love, time and our financial resources - they're his; we don't own anything - to be disciple makers.

Now… I will take Wes Wise as an example. He came to this country [USA] with nothing, he came from Kenya, and he had a tremendous alcohol problem. He was a schoolteacher there, and had come to Christ. And he was changed and wanted very much to serve God and felt he was supposed to go to seminary. We had the joy when he got to this country of meeting him and it was not a big deal for several of us to get together to assure that his way through seminary was paid. He didn't have any money to go to seminary. We provided his housing, his food and his bicycle. We then bought him a ticket back to Kenya where he became seminary president. Now he has been ministering to people all over Kenya. And in my judgment, what you do with individuals in disciple-making evangelism, if you do it right, ends up using the gifts the Father has given. They will use those gifts in the social context. Some of them may end up being a hospital administrator, some may become nurses or doctors, and some may become involved in being a schoolteacher or educator.

And I think whenever we think that we do the social first, then if we get around to it do the evangelism, what you will end up doing will mean that within a few decades there will not be many Christians left. I think historically we can see this. You've got to start at the beginning and I think that people that fear to do that, and it is fear basically, are afraid of actually witnessing, and it is the confrontation aspects that they are fearful of. And because of fear they end up gravitating to the other way because it looks good, sounds good…. But over time the Lord will not be pleased, because the number of Christians, which is what he came for, will decrease instead of increase. I do not know of any historical situation that I can think of, or any country where I have been to work, which is probably 70 countries now, I don't know of any situations where it was a great social movement that produced a massive awakening and a spiritual awakening in the church. Quite the contrary, when there is a spiritual awakening in the church that comes about through evangelism and disciple-making you see enormous social results flow out of that. So to me it is not either or, it is the order in which they occur.

LH. Well, I think that answers the question.

Conclusion

It is clear that the debate continues. Lindsay Brown considers that this will always be the case. He argues for the primacy of proclamation, as does Hanks, but Brown does see that the context can legitimately affect priorities. Neither Brown nor Hanks have really engaged in their responses with the historical situations that I have examined. Carey was faced with great social issues, and he addressed them. The same was true of Knibb, and later of Meyer and Rauschenbusch. None of these Baptists debated the question of "primacy". They simply addressed the needs they saw.

Chapter 5
Conclusion

Starting with William Carey, I have looked in this Dissertation at Baptists in their missionary endeavours. It has been clear that there have been different approaches among Baptists to the question of the connection between evangelism and social concerns. William Carey and William Knibb had a commitment to both, and saw their concern for the social well-being of those they went to share the gospel with as part of their mission. We saw how the issue of slavery shaped the theology of some. A theological system was created to justify the enslavement of Africans. This theology, which was embraced by some Baptists, stated that because of the curse of Ham, it was God's will for men and women of colour to serve the white, civilized, educated population. That theology was rejected by the majority of evangelicals, including Baptists, and eventually slavery was abolished, but the theology lived on for over 100 years. In the 1840s evangelicals attempted to form a world-wide association, the Evangelical Alliance, but they failed because of the slavery issue. It was Baptist leaders who were some of the fiercest opponents of the Evangelical Alliance having any fellowship with slave-owners.

I looked at the rise of new evangelistic figures in the later nineteenth century. D.L. Moody was a formative influence. His outlook, which involved united efforts in evangelism and also social concern, was taken up by others, and I looked especially at Mott. There were others, such as the Baptist leader, F.B. Meyer, who emphasized both spiritual renewal and social change. Meyer also cooperated with others outside the Baptist community, as had Carey and Knibb. John Mott, in particular, developed networks of university students throughout the world. The Student Volunteer Movement was a significant body in this period. Walter Rauschenbusch, also a Baptist, had an influence on Mott. For Rauschenbusch, there was a need to create a theology that would give the church the theological foundation it needed to meet the new world of materialism and also of poverty within American capitalistic society.

His social gospel theology was introduced to the World Student Christian Federation, and it tended to overshadow the predominantly individual call to repentance. However, Rauschenbusch always wanted to have both a call to social reform and a call to conversion.

The 1910 Edinburgh Missionary Conference could be seen as a turning point. From that time the two groups within the evangelical movement, the more conservative and the more liberal, went in different directions. John Mott remained true to the evangelical understand of the need for a personal faith in Jesus Christ, but he also embraced the idea that the church had a mission to "Christianize" the society. The Edinburgh Missionary Conference would lead to the forming of the World Council of Churches in 1948, the primary expression of the ecumenical movement. The focus in the WCC was on unity, but the earlier vision of a unity that would enable mission to take place seemed to fade. Also, there was less emphasis than there had been in the Evangelical Alliance on the place of a common creed or doctrinal statement. However, there was some continuity with the Alliance, which was arguably the first 'ecumenical' body and which stressed the 'catholic' nature of the church.

The study then moved to the 1974 Lausanne Congress on World Evangelism. The idea for the congress was put forward by Billy Graham and much of the leadership during the congress, especially in the theological area, came from John Stott. Lausanne produced a statement in which the church's mission is first of all to proclaim the good news, but also to be concerned for people and society. At Lausanne important Baptists from Latin America questioned the way in which Western evangelicals introduced a dichotomy between evangelism and social action. Since the 1974 Lausanne Congress the topic of evangelism and social concern has continued to be hotly debated in evangelical circles. Billy Graham has been an advocate of the 'primacy of the gospel' over social action. Rene Padilla and others from the two-thirds world have been trying to get the evangelicals to move from this understanding of the gospel to a holistic one. At Cape Town 2010, the doctrinal

statement stressed that both proclamation and social actions are the gospel. There was no dichotomy between the two.

I attempted in the last part of the study to contribute to the current debate, since Cape Town. I opened up some of the dimensions through the interviews. With the historical perspective, which should be valued, there is a contemporary question: who in today's debates can legitimately claim to be true to such great Baptist exemplars as Carey or Knibb? It seems to me that John Piper, who stands in the Calvinistic and Baptist traditions, attempted at Cape Town to hold together proclamation and social concern, but his comments were sharply criticized by Rene Padilla. This is a proof of the tensions that exist in evangelicalism. Both Brown and Hanks, Jr., readily agree that evangelicals are to have a holistic view of the gospel. They differ, however, from Padilla's expression of this. The ideas of West versus East, North versus South, First World versus Two-Thirds World require further analysis. Centres of influence change over time. I believe from my experience and reading that there is an apprehension on the part of many evangelicals when there is a talk of a 'social gospel', as was advocated by Rauschenbusch. I consider there needs to be a more charitable spirit between those evangelicals who differ. I appreciated Lindsay Brown's comments on how one can be a passionate advocate for an 'overlooked truth', but that over time people become judgmental and embittered, because not everyone agrees with their position.

The assessment by Billy Graham and others of what happened at the beginning of the 20th century, with the advance of the social gospel emphasis within the evangelical world, remains an influential perspective. It is possible to have the emphasis on personal salvation eclipsed by the message of a striving for a more just world. This produced two distinct directions, which did not relate well to each other for many years - the ecumenical and the evangelical. Are we seeing history repeat itself? Will there be a division among Baptists and others who indentify themselves as being evangelical over proclamation and social action? I appreciated John Piper's plea at Cape Town:

> I plead with you. Don't choose between the two truths. Embrace them both. It doesn't mean that we will all spend our time in the same way. God forbid. But it means we will let the Bible define reality and define love. Could Lausanne say – could the evangelical church say – we Christians care about all suffering, especially eternal suffering? I hope we can say that.

Some who heard or have read that statement have seen in it the 'dichotomy' which they reject. However, my reading of it is that Piper was embracing a holistic view of the message of the church to the world, addressing both the temporal and the eternal. Time will tell if evangelicals can walk together as they navigate through this issue in the new century, with its own challenges.

Bibliography

Addison, Steve, *Embracing Another Gospel*, www.movements.net/?s=embracing+another+gospel, 16 December 2009

Baker, Robert A., *The Southern Baptist Convention and its People 1607-1992* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1974)

Barnes, William Wright, *The Southern Baptist Convention 1845-1953* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1954)

Bebbington, D.W., *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* (London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1989)

Brackney, William H., *Baptists in North America*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006)

Cameron, J.E.M., *Christ Our Reconciler* (Nottingham, Inter-Varsity Press, 2012)

Carey, S.P., *William Carey* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923)

Carey, William, *An Enquiry into the obligation of Christians to use means for the conversion of the heathen* (London: The Carey Kingsgate Press Limited, 1961)

Carter, T.G., *The Journal and Selected Letters of William Carey* (Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2000)

Chapman, J. Wilbur, *The Life and Work of Dwight Lyman Moody*, 1900 (Online book www.biblebelievers.com),

Clements, Keith, *Faith on the Frontier: A life of J.H. Oldham* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999)

Cox, Jeffrey, *The British Missionary Enterprise since 1700* (London: Routledge, 2008)

Cross, F.L., and Livingstone, E.A., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Douglas, J.D., *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, (Minneapolis: World Wide Press Publications, 1975)

Drewery, Mary, *William Carey Shoemaker and Missionary* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978)

Dudley-Smith, Timothy, *John Stott: A Global Ministry* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2001)

Evensen, Bruce J., *God's Man for the Gilded Age: D.L. Moody and the rise of Modern Mass Evangelism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Evans, Christopher E., *The Kingdom is Always but Coming* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2004)

Evans, Curtis J., *The Burden of Black Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Evangelical Alliance -Report of the Conference 1846 (London, Partridge and Oakey, 1847)

Fisher, Galen M*., John R. Mott: Architect of co-operation and unity*, (New York: Association Press, 1952)

George, Timothy, *Faithful Witness: The Life and Mission of William Carey* (Leicester: IVP, 1991).

George, Timothy, *Mr. Moody and the Evangelical Tradition* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004)

Gonzalez, Justo, *Christian Thought Revisited*, (New York: Orbis Books, 1999)

Hall, Catherine, *Civilising Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002)

Hammond, Peter, *What a difference one person can Make*, frontline.org.za/articles/whatdifference_onemake.htm

Hinton, John Howard, *Memoir of William Knibb* (London: Houlston and Stoneman, 1847)

Hirrel, Leo P., *Children of Wrath* (Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1998)

Hopkins, C. Howard, *John T. Mott*, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979)

Kik, J. Marcellus, *Ecumenism and the Evangelical*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958)

Marsden, G.M., *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980)

Mason, J.C.S., *The Moravian Church and the Missionary Awakening in England, 1760-1800* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001)

McLoughlin, William G., *Modern Revivalism*, (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1959)

Mott, John R., *The Pastor and Modern Missions: A Plea for Leadership in World Evangelization* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement, 1904)

Mott, John R., *The Present World Situation* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1915)

Noll, Mark A., *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001)

Padilla, C. Rene, 'The Future or the Lausanne Movement'*, International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Vol. 35, No. 2, Overseas Ministries Study Center, New Haven, April 2011

Padilla, C. Rene, *Mission Between the Times* (Carlisle: Langham Partnership International, 2010)

Payne, E.A., *Freedom in Jamaica: Some chapters in the story of the BMS* (London: Carey Press, 1933)

Payne, E.A., *The Baptist Union: A Short History* (London: Baptist Union, 1959)

Peterson, Thomas Virgil, *Ham and Jepheth* (Metuchen, N.J. & London: The Scarecrow Press & the American Theological Library Association, 1978)

Pierson, A.T., *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century* (New York: Funk and Wagnall's Co., 1900)

Pollock, J.C., *Moody: a biographical portrait of the pacesetter in modern mass evangelism* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963)

Potts, E.D., *British Baptist Missionaries in India, 1793-1837* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967)

Quodlibet Journal: Volume 2 Number 1, January 2000

Rauschenbusch, Walter, *Christianity and the Social Crisis in the 21st Century* (New York: Harper Collins Publishing, 2007), edited by P. Raushenbush

Randall, I.M., *'Conscientious Conviction': Joseph Angus (1816-1902) and Nineteenth-Century Baptist Life* (Oxford: CHHH Occasional Papers, 2010)

Randall, Ian, and Hilborn, David, *One Body in Christ: the History and Significance of the Evangelical Alliance*, (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2001)

Randall, Ian, *Religious Liberty in Continental Europe: Campaigning by British Baptists, 1840s to 1930s* (Oxford: Whitley Publications, 2012)

Randall, I.M., *Spirituality and Social Change: The Contribution of F.B. Meyer (1847-1929)* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2003)

Rouse, Ruth and Neill, Stephen, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, (London: SPCK, 1954)

Schattschneider, D.A., 'William Carey, Modern Missions and the Moravian Influence', *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (1998)

Shurden, Walter B., *Not An Easy Journey: Some Transitions in Baptist Life* (Macon, GE: Mercer University Press, 2005)

Sibley, Inez Knibb, *The Baptists of Jamaica* (Kingston, Jamaica: The Jamaica Baptist Union, 1965)

Stanley, Brian, *The History of the Baptist Missionary Society* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992)

Stanley, Brian, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910*, (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009)

The Lausanne Story, (Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, 1987)

The Manila Manifesto (Pasadena, Calif.: Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, 1989)

Tizon, F.A. *Transformation after Lausanne* (Oxford: Regnum Books. 2008)

www.amazon.com/Christian-thought-RIvisted-three-thrology/dp/1570752559 as seen Aug. 28, 2012

www.brianmclaren.net/archives/2005/09/converation_about_walter_rauschenbusch_277.html

www.lausanne.org/en/documents/manila-manifesto.html